



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/662,319 | 09/16/2003 | Alexander Vincent Danilo | 00169.002728. | 9258 |
| 5514 | 7590 | 07/19/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 1290 Avenue of the Americas NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800 | | | DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | 2625 | | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 07/19/2011 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/662,319 | DANILO, ALEXANDER VINCENT |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | PAWANDEEP DHINGRA | 2625 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2011.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 17, 19-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final action filed on 5/2/2011.
- Claims 17 and 19-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments, filed 5/2/2011 have been entered and fully considered.

In light of the applicant's amendments, the rejection(s) have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection(s) have been made, and applicant's arguments have been rendered moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Previous 101 rejections to claims have been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Moore, US 2002/0015039 in view of Dermer, US 5,668,931.

Re claim 17, Moore discloses a computer-implemented method of rendering an image (see title), comprising a plurality of overlapping graphic objects (see figure 8, it has two overlapping objects blue and red, paragraphs 62-63), the computer comprising a processor configured to implement the method and a computer readable storage medium to store the plurality of overlapping graphic objects (see figs. 1-2 with text), said method comprising the steps of: generating a list of input edges in accordance with a plurality of boundaries of the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, wherein some of the input edges are overlapping (see fig. 11, paragraphs 62-64) (also see paragraphs 67-79); producing a list of non-intersecting edges from the list of input edges (see figs. 8-13 with text, note that there are two objects, red 90, and blue 80 (fig. 8) which overlap and thus three non-intersecting edges for areas 92, 84; 82, 96, 94; and 98, 86 (fig. 8) form the input overlapping edges are produced); converting the produced list of non-intersecting edges into an active edge list (see figs. 2, 8-10 with text); rendering the active edge list into a

plurality of sequential pixels (see paragraphs 54-55, 67, 82-84); wherein the list of non-intersecting edges defines a plurality of boundaries of a plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects, said plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects being visually equivalent to the plurality of overlapping graphic objects (see figs. 6, 8-9 with text) (also see figs. 10-13 with text).

Moore fails to explicitly disclose producing a list of non-intersecting edges from the list of input edges of the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, by reordering and redefining at least one intersecting edge of the plurality of overlapping input edges on a per-scan-line basis, wherein the list of non- intersecting edges defines (a) a plurality of boundaries of a plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects at the same priority level; said plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects being visually equivalent to the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, and (b) a color for each of the plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects.

However, Dermer teaches producing a list of non-intersecting edges from the list of input edges of the plurality of overlapping graphic objects (overlapping objects, fig. 2, 6), by reordering and redefining at least one intersecting edge of the plurality of overlapping input edges on a per-scan-line basis (see figs. 6-9) (also see figs. 10-11), wherein the list of non- intersecting edges defines (a) a plurality of boundaries of a plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects at the same priority level (see figs. 7, 9) said plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects being visually equivalent to the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, and (b) a color for each of the plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects (see figs. 14, 16), (also see figs. 17, 19); converting the

produced list of non-intersecting edges into an active edge list (active edge table, col. 13).

Therefore, it would have been advantageous to modify the method of rendering graphic objects as disclosed by Moore to include the overlapping graphic processing and edge generating techniques as taught by Dermer for the benefit of providing automatic compensation for misregistration of images requiring further image processing as taught by Dermer in abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to combine the system of Moore with the system of Dermer to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Re Claim 19, Moore discloses an apparatus for rendering an image (rendering apparatus, fig. 3, paragraph 23) comprising a plurality of overlapping graphic objects (see figure 8, it has two overlapping objects blue and red, paragraphs 62-63), said apparatus comprising: generating means (display list generation 12, fig. 2, "the display list generation 12 is preferably implemented as a software module executing on the host processor 2", paragraph 66) for generating a list of input edges in accordance with a plurality of boundaries of the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, wherein some of the input edges are overlapping (see fig. 11, paragraphs 62-64) (also see paragraphs 67-79); producing a list of non-intersecting edges from the list of input edges (see figs. 8-13 with text, note that there are two objects, red 90, and blue 80 (fig. 8) which overlap and thus three non-intersecting edges for areas 92, 84; 82, 96, 94; and 98, 86 (fig. 8) form the input overlapping edges are produced); converting means for converting the produced list of non-intersecting edges into an active edge list (see figs. 2, 8-10 with

text); rendering means for rendering active edge list into a plurality of sequential pixels (see paragraphs 54-55, 67, 82-84); wherein the list of non-intersecting edges defines a plurality of boundaries of a plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects said plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects being visually equivalent to the plurality of overlapping graphic objects and a color for each of the plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects (see figs. 6, 8-9 with text) (also see figs. 10-13 with text).

However, Dermer teaches producing a list of non-intersecting edges from the list of input edges of the plurality of overlapping graphic objects (overlapping objects, fig. 2, 6), by reordering and redefining at least one intersecting edge of the plurality of overlapping input edges on a per-scan-line basis (see figs. 6-9) (also see figs. 10-11), wherein the list of non- intersecting edges defines (a) a plurality of boundaries of a plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects at the same priority level (see figs. 7, 9) said plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects being visually equivalent to the plurality of overlapping graphic objects, and (b) a color for each of the plurality of non-overlapping graphic objects (see figs. 14, 16), (also see figs. 17, 19); converting the produced list of non-intersecting edges into an active edge list (active edge table, col. 13).

Re Claim 20, claim 20 recites identical features, as claim 17, except claim 20 merely deals with executing the method of claim 17 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 17 are applicable for claim 20.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625